

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 RONALD ROSENBERG,

12 Petitioner,

2:04-cv-02668-GEB-GGH-P

13 vs.

14 THOMAS L. CAREY, et al.,

15 Respondents.

ORDER

16 _____/
17 Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a
18 petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
19 § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate
20 Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General
21 Order No. 262.

22 On August 10, 2005, the magistrate judge filed findings
23 and recommendations herein which were served on all parties and
24 which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the
25 findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days.
26

1 Petitioner has filed objections to the findings and
2 recommendations.

3 On September 14, 2005, respondent filed objections.
4 Because the objections are untimely, they shall be disregarded.
5 Local Rule 6-136(d); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a).

6 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C.
7 § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-304, this court has conducted a
8 de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the
9 entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to
10 be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

11 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

12 1. The findings and recommendations filed August 10,
13 2005, are adopted in full; and

14 2. Petitioner's application for a writ of habeas
15 corpus is denied.

16 Dated: September 28, 2005

17
18 /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
19 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
20 United States District Judge
21
22
23
24
25
26